

Appl. No. 10/623,484  
Amdt. dated Aug. 23, 2005  
Office Action mailed March 23, 2005

**General Authorization Under 37 CFR 1.136(a)(3)**

The Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to treat this or any future response requiring a petition for an extension of time, as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time. A Petition for a Two-Month Extension of Time also accompanies this Amendment and Response to Office Action.

In addition, the Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees deemed due under 37 CFR 1.17 to Deposit Account 19-2260.

Further, if it is determined that any other fees are due in this application, or if it is determined that an overpayment has been made, the Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account 19-2260 as appropriate. Finally, if Deposit Account 19-2260 does not have sufficient to pay the required fees, the Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees deemed due under 37 CFR 1.17 to Deposit Account 14-1190.

Appl. No. 10/623,484  
Amdt. dated Aug. 23, 2005  
Office Action mailed March 23, 2005

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the amendments presented herein, six claims have been amended and no claims have been canceled or added. Consequently, it is believed that no additional claim fees have been generated by this filing. A Petition for a two-month extension of time accompanies this document. If it is determined that any additional fees are due in this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 19-2260 in the amount of such fees.

Section 2 of the Office Action requests amendment of the Abstract. An amended abstract is being submitted via this Amendment and Response. A clean copy of the new Abstract is presented on the unnumbered page that follows the signature page of this Amendment and Response. It is believed that the amendments presented herein will satisfy the concerns expressed in the Office Action regarding the content of the Abstract.

Sections 3, 4 and 5 of the Office Action reject claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14-17, 19 and 76 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). Applicants believe that the pending claims are allowable over the cited references.

For example, independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify that it applies to a multi-device system wherein at least two of the data-handling devices have a readiness light. Further, each readiness light can signal whether the data-handling system as a whole is ready for operation. Pellaumail does not teach a second readiness light located on a second data-handling device that is in communication with a first data-handling device having a readiness light. Further, it would not have been obvious to add a readiness light to the master station, 16, Fig. 1, of Pellaumail. Given the shopping

Appl. No. 10/623,484  
Amdt. dated Aug. 23, 2005  
Office Action mailed March 23, 2005

application addressed in Pellaumail, it would have served no purpose to do so since the purpose of the Pellaumail light is to indicate to a customer which of the shopping terminals should be used for shopping. In addition, there would have been no motivation to include a signal light on the Pellaumail terminal since you would not want a customer to attempt to remove the master station for shopping.

Further, the master station 16 of Pellaumail is not a data-handling or data collection device as required in pending claims 1 and 76 for example. Rather, the master station is a control device that services the terminals (10, Fig. 1), decides which terminal(s) can be selected by a customer, decides whether a terminal can be taken by a given customer, and receives data that has been input into the terminals.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 58, Thomas does not, for example, disclose a method for troubleshooting a multi-device data handling system with a computerized device having a readiness light. Thomas teaches a system that aids the troubleshooting of a single electronic cash register. Thomas gives feedback regarding a single component, not feedback regarding a multi-device data handling system. Thomas does not signal a multi-device data handling system problem via readiness light. Further still, Thomas does not teach initiating a diagnostic procedure via a user interface of the computerized device, the computerized device being a member of a multi-device data handling system being tested. The testing apparatus of Thomas is not a part of the system being tested in Thomas. In addition, the light in Thomas is located on the testing apparatus whereas in the pending claim 58 the readiness light is located on one of the devices that is being tested.

Appl. No. 10/623,484  
Amdt. dated Aug. 23, 2005  
Office Action mailed March 23, 2005

Sections 6 through 10 of the Office Action reject claims 4, 6, 9, 12, 13, 18, 20-57, 61-63 and 69-74 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicants believe that the pending claims are allowable over the cited references.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 25, Thomas does not disclose a method using a device readiness light on a computerized device to signal whether the computerized device and the multi-device data handling system of which it is a member are ready for use. Rather, Thomas teaches a system that aids the troubleshooting of a single electronic cash register. Thomas gives feedback regarding a single component, not feedback regarding a multi-device data handling system. Thus, it is believed that claim 25 and the claims dependent thereon are allowable over Thomas. For related reasons, it is believed that independent claim 75 is also allowable over Thomas.


Appl. No. 10/623,484  
Amdt. dated Aug. 23, 2005  
Office Action mailed March 23, 2005

In closing, Applicants believe that the above remarks provide a complete response to the issues presented in the Office Action. Further, as a result of the demonstrated allowability of the claims, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

August 23, 2005  
Date

By

  
Michael F. Williams  
Reg. No. 39,875

Simmons, Perrine, Albright & Ellwood, P.L.C.  
115 First Street SE, Suite 1200  
Cedar Rapids, IA 52401-1266  
Telephone: (319) 366-7641 (ext. 222)  
Facsimile No. (319) 366-1917